

REMARKS

The Final Office Action of January 23, 2012 has been carefully reviewed. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejections and allow the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3-15, 17-20, and 31-34 are pending. Claims 1, 3-15, 17-20, and 31-34 stand rejected. Claim 3 is hereby objected to. Claims 1-34 are canceled. Claims 35-46 are new and pending.

Specification

Amendments to the specification are presented herein to provide clarity and understanding regarding acronyms referenced in the specification. Applicants submit each of the acronyms UMTS, CDMA, APN and PLMN were well-known in the art at the time of the invention. In particular, the term “APN” was well-known in the art at the time of the invention as “Access Point Name”, and was fully described in 3GPP Technical Specification Group Core Network; Numbering, addressing and identification (Release 1999); 3GPP TS 23.003 V3.13.0 (2003-09) (“TS 23.003”), section 9 “Definition of Access Point Name”, which document is presented herewith. For example, TS 23.003 states:

In the GPRS backbone, an Access Point Name (APN) is a reference to a GGSN.

...

The APN is composed of two parts as follows:

- The APN Network Identifier which defines to which external network the GGSN is connected to and optionally a requested service by the MS. This part of the APN is mandatory.
- The APN Operator Identifier which defines in which PLMN GPRS backbone the GGSN is located. This part of the APN is optional.

...

In order to guarantee uniqueness of APN Network Identifier within the GPRS PLMN(s), an APN Network Identifier containing more than one label corresponds to an Internet domain name. This name should only

be allocated by the PLMN to an organisation that has officially reserved this name in the Internet domain. Other types of APN Network Identifiers are not guaranteed to be unique within the GPRS PLMN(s).

(p. 18, Section 9.1-9.11). Thus, as APN was well-known in the art as described in TS 23.003 above, and the terms Universal Mobile Telecommunications System (UMTS), Code Division Multiple Access (CDMA), and Public Land Mobile Network (PLMN) were also well-known in the art at the time of the invention, Applicants submit that no new matter has been added in the following amendments to the specification.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 3 is objected to because of informalities. Claim 3 is canceled herein rendering the objection moot.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS

In the Final Office Action mailed January 23, 2012, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5-14, 31, 33, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9-15, 17-20, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over European Patent Application No. 0781064 to Jorma, et al. ("Jorma") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0129971 to Gopikanth ("Gopikanth").

Claims 32 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gopikanth in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,606,242 to Whelan, et al. ("Whelan").

Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gopikanth in view of Whelan and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0186695 to Bridges, et al. ("Bridges").

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorma in view of Gopikanth in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0224689 to Raghuram, et al. ("Raghuram").

Claims 1-34 are canceled herein rendering the rejections moot.

Claims 35-46 are new. Applicants submit that the claims, as presented, are supported in the specification as originally filed, including at least Figures 1, 4, and 6-8, and page 11, line 15 to page 12, line 2 (¶ [0037] of the application publication US 2005/0193150); page 14, lines 5-16 (¶ [0043] of the publication); page 15, lines 4-16 (¶ [0047]-[0048] of the publication); and page 18, lines 11-23 (¶ [0056] of the publication).

Claim 35

Claim 35 recites:

A method of operating a mobile node comprising the steps of:
selecting between a first radio access network supporting a first Access Point Name (APN) and a second radio access network supporting a second APN,
wherein the first APN and second APN have different identities and the mobile node makes the selection based upon the identity of the first APN.

Applicants submit that neither Jorma nor Gopikanth, previously cited in rejecting canceled claim 1, either alone or in combination, discloses the features of claim 35.

Jorma discloses the user may select a network “By Name” or “By Service” (col. 10, lines 8-11; Fig. 4B depicting the user interface). Types of services are, for example, data and facsimile services (col. 10, lines 48-55) or Data and Short Message Service (SMS) (col. 11, lines 29-44). Thus, While Jorma discloses network selection based on a service provided by an available network, Jorma does not disclose that a network is selected based on the identity of an Access Point Name (APN) supported by the available networks, as required by claim 35. Applicants submit that a service provided by an available network, e.g. SMS service, is not equivalent to an identity of an APN supported by an available network because the APN indicates the reach of access provided by the available network to other networks for a mobile node. Thus, Jorma fails to disclose the features of claim 35.

Gopikanth discloses selecting a PLMN based on class-of-service offered to a mobile station in each of the communication cells, e.g. guaranteed bandwidth, no-guaranteed bandwidth (¶ [0021]-[0029]). The mobile station selects the class-of-service required by the mobile station, e.g. for streaming video (¶ [0037]. Thus, while Gopikanth discloses network selection based on a class-of-service provided by an available network, Gopikanth does not disclose that a network is selected based on the identity of an Access Point Name (APN) supported by the available networks, as required by claim 35. Applicants submit that a class-of-service provided by a network, e.g. guaranteed bandwidth, is not equivalent to an identity of an APN supported by a network because the identity of the APN indicates the reach of access provided by a network to other networks for a mobile node. Thus, Jorma fails to disclose the features of claim 35 or cure the deficiencies of Jorma.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 35 is allowable. Claim 40 is similar in scope to claim 35, and therefore, is allowable for the same reasons stated above for claim 35.

Claim 45

Claim 45 recites:

A method of operating a central database visible to a plurality of cellular communication systems, the method comprising:

maintaining central database entries which provide the identity of a radio access network to which a UE subscribes in its home radio access network; and
maintaining central database entries which provide the identities of APNs supported by other radio access networks.

Jorma and Gopikanth fail to disclose at least a central database, as provided in claim 45. Jorma discloses a mobile station maintains a single, prioritized list of all available networks (i.e., all public, residential, and private networks”) (col. 4, lines 21-24). Gopikanth discloses that the mobile station initiates discovery or otherwise searches for a suitable PLMN (§ [0033]). Thus, the list of available networks is maintained by a mobile station in both Jorma and Gopikanth. Accordingly, neither Jorma nor Gopikanth, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest at least a central database required by claim 45.

Claim 46

Claim 46 recites:

A radio system comprising:

...

a central database;

wherein the core network, radio access network and central database are intercoupled; and

wherein the central database is provided with the identity of the home radio access network of a mobile node and the identities of the APNs supported by a plurality of other radio access networks.

Claim 46 includes similar features of claim 45, including at least a central database. Jorma and Gopikanth fail to disclose, teach, or suggest at least those features of claim 46 for the same reasons as stated for claim 45. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 46 is allowable for the same reasons as claim 45.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants respectfully submit that the application, in its present form, is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or comments or otherwise feels it would be helpful in expediting the application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (972) 731-2288. The Applicants intend this communication to be a complete response to the Final Office Action mailed January 23, 2012.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any fee associated with any of the foregoing papers submitted herewith or any fees during the prosecution of the present case to Deposit Account No. 50-1515, Conley Rose, P.C.

Respectfully submitted,

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.

Date: April 23, 2012

5601 Granite Parkway, Suite 750
Plano, Texas 75024
Telephone: (972) 731-2288
Facsimile: (972) 731-2289

/J. Robert Brown, Jr./
J. Robert Brown, Jr.
Reg. No. 45,438

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS